

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9 WESTERN DIVISION  
10

11 MIGUEL MARIO LAM, ) No. CV 08-05327-CBM (VBK)  
12 )  
13 ) Petitioner, ) ORDER (1) ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING  
14 ) v. ) THE AMENDED REPORT AND  
15 ) RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED  
16 ) STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE, AND (2)  
17 J. HARTLEY, ) DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR WRIT  
18 ) OF HABEAS CORPUS  
19 ) Respondent. )  
20 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
21

22 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636, the Court has made a de novo review  
23 of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus ("Petition"), Respondent's  
24 Answer, Petitioner's Reply, all of the records herein and the Amended  
25 Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge  
26 ("Amended Report").  
27  
28

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

1       **IT IS ORDERED** that: (1) the Court accepts and adopts the Amended  
2 Report and Recommendation, (2) the Court declines to issue a  
3 Certificate of Appealability ("COA");<sup>1</sup> and (3) Judgment be entered  
4 denying and dismissing the Petition with prejudice.

5  
6  
7 

8 DATED: 9/22/20

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
CONSUELO B. MARSHALL  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21       <sup>1</sup> Under 28 U.S.C. §2253(c)(2), a COA may issue "only if the  
22 applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a  
23 constitutional right." The Supreme Court has held that, to obtain a  
24 Certificate of Appealability under §2253(c), a habeas petitioner must  
25 show that "reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that  
26 matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a  
27 different manner or that the issues presented were 'adequate to  
28 deserve encouragement to proceed further'." Slack v. McDaniel, 529  
U.S. 473, 483-84, 120 S.Ct. 1595 (2000)(internal quotation marks  
omitted); see also Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336, 123 S.Ct.  
1029 (2003). After review of Petitioner's contentions herein, this  
Court concludes that Petitioner has not made a substantial showing of  
the denial of a constitutional right, as is required to support the  
issuance of a COA.